DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 016 HE 001 837

AUTHOR	Holcomb, Howard E., Ed.
TITLE	Educational Strategies for Social Change. Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Lutheran Educational Conference of North America (56th, Houston, January 10-11, 1970).
INSTITUTION	Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	51p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.65
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Related Colleges, Educational Change, Educational Strategies, *Higher Education, Institutional Role, *Social Change
IDENTIFIERS	*Lutheran Colleges

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America is to explore problems in higher education, especially those related to Lutheran higher education. It also seeks to share information, suggest strategies, and assist member institutions in their programs. This volume contains the papers and proceedings of the 56th annual meeting. The first paper: "Educational Strategies for Social Change," by Sidney A. Rand, suggests some broad outlines for change: (1) the college must recognize its involvement in society; (2) the college must know its own theological and philosophical foundations; (3) a college must choose its priorities carefully; (4) a college needs to select carefully those areas of direct involvement where it seeks to effect change in society; and (5) a college should not forget that it is the product and a part of its society; it is itself therefore subject to change. Two commentaries by Joseph L. Knutson and Jeff Johnson follow this paper. The second paper is "What's so Special about a Lutheran College?" by Louis Almen. The third paper is "Higher Education Must Be Modernized," by C. C. Colvert. The Program, a Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, and lists of the Board of Directors and Institutional Presidents conclude the report. (AF)

ED0 45016

EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Papers and Proceedings
of the 56th Annual Convention
Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 837

Shamrock Hilton
Houston, Texas
January 10-11, 1970

LECNA

The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

The Lutheran Educational Conference of North America traces its history to 1910, making it possibly the oldest inter-Lutheran organization. It was reconstituted in 1967 from its predecessor, the former National Lutheran Educational Conference.

The purpose of the Conference is to consider problems in higher education, especially those related to Lutheran higher education. Further, it seeks to share information, suggest strategy, and assist member institutions in their programs.

LECNA functions as a free forum in which representatives of Lutheran institutions of higher education, boards, organizations, and individuals discuss the problems and concerns of Lutheran higher education, collegiate or theological.

The papers and proceedings which follow are the product of LECNA's 56th annual convention, held at the Shamrock Hilton, Houston, Texas, January 10-11, 1970. The theme, "Educational Strategies for Social Change," provided a basis for discussion of the accelerating rate of societal change and education's response.

HOWARD E. HOLCOMB
Editor

March 1970
Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Educational Strategies for Social Change	SIDNEY A. RAND	1
Commentary	JOSEPH L. KNUTSON	16
	JEFF JOHNSON	21
What's So Special About a Lutheran College	LOUIS ALMEN	24
Higher Education Must Be Modernized	C. C. COLVERT	38
56th Annual Program		49
Report of Secretary-Treasurer		51
Board of Directors		58
Institutional Presidents		59

Educational Strategies for Social Change

SIDNEY A. RAND

In the midst of all our problems, not least the financial ones, it seems to me we need more than ever to make clear to our society that the Christian faith makes a difference in life and that we must operate our colleges in such a way that this is evident. If we don't, our besetting problems will perhaps devour us. And, perhaps they should.

We speak about "change" these days as if our generation had invented it. Every organization in our society appears to be bent on proving that it understands change, that change is important and above all, that the organization involved is "with it," that is, contributing to that new day when things will be different.

One refreshing thing about the use of this concept is that it is more modest than some of the catch-words we have used in the past to describe what goes on in society. There was "progress," for example. A generation or two ago we spoke about social change as progress, implying that whatever happened was an improvement on what had gone before. Now we're not at all certain that change is progress and it is more becoming of us to use the lesser word.

We've also had such key-words as "evolution" and "development" which, like progress, assign a moral superiority to each succeeding act of man.

So, I say "change" is a change in the right direction. It leaves open to later interpretation the quality of what has taken place.

I.

One of the significant changes which has come about in the academic world in the past few decades is the realization by all concerned that the "ivory tower" is gone. It took wars, poverty, and social upheaval to do it, but today there is general agreement that colleges are part of the larger society.

They are both the products of it as well as contributors to it. As Hans J. Morgenthau said last year:

> **American institutions of higher learning reflect the values and interests of American society as Russian universities naturally and inevitably reflect even more stringently the interests and**

> **involvements of the totalitarian society of the Soviet Union. This is inevitable and this has always been so. But what is new is the transformation of especially the more prestigious universities into gigantic service stations for the government and for the big corporations.**
>
> *(Agony and Promise, p. 7)*

We in the private, church-connected liberal arts colleges may say we are less directly enmeshed than are other colleges in the society of which we are a part, but the difference is not as great as we once thought it to be. We look to graduate schools to help us determine departmental offerings, to the professions to tell us what to teach future teachers and lawyers or nurses, and to business to assist in setting up programs for the aspiring junior executive. All of us have known, and usually enjoyed, the way government grants have moved us into programs we previously didn't know we were interested in. Various accrediting groups keep us fairly homogeneous. And most of us have since our founding had our lives determined more or less by the influences which have pressed upon us from our churches.

These days we are expected to enroll a substantial number of students who are members of minority groups, to offer special courses of study regarding these minorities, to restructure our institutions to give new place and voice to students and faculty in policy decisions, and to turn our institutions into active participants in the ongoing social revolution.

Tend Toward Conservatism

And yet, despite these pressures, colleges tend to retain a conservative bent. To a certain extent all structures of society perform this way. Self-preservation dictates that they orient to the status-quo. They have a stake in things as they are. Church colleges are in some ways more inclined to do this than certain other social institutions, for they are committed to basic purposes rooted in what we have considered the unchanging values: God, redemption, the dignity of man, personal responsibility, *et al.*

Because of our Christian orientation we are motivated to serve mankind. This can easily translate itself into an acceptance of things as they are rather than a dedication to change. We see ourselves as serving God and mankind as we send educated persons into the mainstream of society to play leadership roles in the next generation.

Sidney A. Rand is President of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. His address was the first Lina R. Meyer Lecture.

II.

In speaking of social change to fellow educators I need not dwell long on what we mean by this idea. But a few words of outline may be in order.

There is change due to *growth*. The population of our country and the world continues to grow and with it the problems of urbanization, deterioration of the environment, economic "giantism" and the big, ever more centralized government.

C. P. Snow speaks of all this leading to "despair" and cites despair rather than the specific conditions which bring it on, as the real danger man faces today. Unless man can grasp some straws of hope he will soon become extinct, the product of problems created by "growth".

> Ours may be the first generation in which growth has come to be clearly seen as a menace, a malignancy. But even yet most institutions and governments speak and plan as though unending growth were a social good, much to be desired and diligently to be pursued.

There is social change related to the uses of *power* which is also an area of concern for us. Power has always been a factor in social change. "Might" may never have made "right," but it has effected major changes in the direction of man's history. In our day power is perhaps more dangerous than ever before because of the increasing disparity between the "haves" and the "have-nots." Groups in society see that power is needed to effect change, whether it be political power, economic power or sheer physical force. Polarization in society results from the conviction on the part of many that the effective use of power has eluded them.

Victims of Events

The same is true of nations. As the cold war moves on—sometimes warmer rather than colder—large sections of the world watch in horror, awe and jealousy, knowing they are victims rather than the makers of the events which determine their destiny.

There is also social change related to the *structures of society*. Are democratic institutions best? Why have they not brought solutions to more problems? The question we have asked ourselves about how colleges and universities should be governed is simply a mirror of that greater question in all of society. How shall groups of men be organized so that life is satisfying for all?

Much of the restlessness we know in our day is due to doubt as

to the way society is organized. Traditional structures are suspect. "Hierarchical" organizations with "leaders" at the top and "followers" elsewhere, are being questioned in family, state, church and business. No one knows yet whether or not new forms will emerge, but we do know that we are living through a time of honest questioning of the way things have been done.

> Finally I would cite social change related to *attitudes* and *values*. This is the religious or ethical area of life. Many of the changes which characterize our time are due to the fact that new and different answers are being given to the age-old questions regarding what matters most, the worth of man as an individual and in society, the place of personal integrity in life and the relative importance of this life and the life hereafter.

If what I have said makes it sound as though most of the fundamentals of life are up for grabs, then let it be said that that is exactly the case. One need only attend a few movies, read a few best sellers, or keep eyes and ears open to the behavior of all of us in order to know that.

This is our world of change in 1970.

III.

In this kind of a world what should a Lutheran college be doing? The answer to that question is our assignment here today! We can only suggest the broadest outline of the answer.

A. The college must recognize its involvement in society.

Perhaps we should say, "immersion" instead of "involvement." We've always known we were part of our society. But in our time some new sense of the total way in which that is true is needed.

And I mean involved in the sense of being responsible. We are not just "related" to the "world." We are not just "serving" society as though we were something apart from that society. We are not simply the critics called upon to study and analyze our world and hopefully send out some graduates to improve on it.

We are responsible for the world. Not we alone, of course. But we and lots of others. And we must share the blame as we take some of the credit. The society is ours, not someone else's.

We work as colleges in this world of social change. As we work we are citizens of both the kingdom of the greater society and the kingdom

of academia. Whether we like it or not we can escape neither. Even as we cannot withdraw from the world to the quiet halls of ivy so we cannot escape the reasonable requirements laid upon us as educational institutions by running to some activist program of social reform in the name of relevance or contemporaneity.

> We with our learning and our nurturing of men and women to be the citizen of our society have helped create whatever world this is with its meaning or meaninglessness. And we must not, either in the name of academic excellence or in the name of our Christian faith, forsake the world we have helped to fashion. It is the arena of our continuing struggle to be sound and healthy educational institutions.

To be a college in this time is to be involved in entangling alliances with social movements, with the world of business and of course with the Church. The frustrating thing is that no one knows at any given moment whether the alliances a college has made are the right ones.

But, given the society we are in, we must seek to be party to those areas of our common life where education in the truest sense of the word is taking place. Students and faculty must find the opportunity to know first-hand the problems our society faces. Text books and campus activities must be supplemented with exposure to the ways in which man is living and struggling with his problems outside the walls of the college.

In this there is give and take, trial and error, and anything but peace and quiet. But peace and quiet are not to be the lot of honest colleges in these days.

B. The college must know its own theological and philosophical foundations.

We are living in a time when the ties between Church and college continue to loosen. I am not one who believes that the manner in which these ties have been structured in the past must forever remain the same. But I do believe that any college which identifies with the Church must know what that means in terms of the day in which we live and must do its work from a consciously held position.

> **Every social institution must know its goals and its reasons for existence. A church college surely must know these things and live its life on that basis.**

Not all colleges should be alike. The guiding principles need not be identical in all cases. There is need in our time for healthy variety

among colleges. One of the saddest facts about the contemporary educational scene is the manner in which colleges seem to ape one another in programs and goals.

Dr. Stephen Tonsor, Professor of history at the University of Michigan, sounds an alarm when he says:

> The ideological and cultural uniformity of higher education in America is a disgrace. Why is it that our colleges and universities have conformed themselves over the past two decades to the orthodoxy of secular liberalism? Why has the atmosphere been so increasingly hostile to open debate? Why does it take the crisis of the exclusion of the Negro from the university to make us see that not only people but ideas have been excluded by higher education?
>
> *(The Critical Ingredient: Education,* p. 17)

If our day calls for anything, it calls for a clear voice from the Lutheran college speaking from a set of principles and convictions that lie much deeper than the simple observation of the known problems of society.

There is a whole catalog of undergirding principles which can be effective guides to the life of a college: God's presence in human life, human fallibility and educability, the sure conviction that progress is not automatic, the danger of self-interest to individuals and to social institutions. You can complete the list.

> Many of our students are reminding us these days of what firmly held ideals can do. We have committed pacifists on our campus. I don't agree with their basic position, but I admire the manner in which they permit their conviction to guide their lives.

Conviction Permits Freedom

Anyone in the business of education needs to operate from a firm set of guiding principles regarding man and the meaning of his life. With the convictions we claim to have as colleges of the Church we are permitted a certain freedom which should lead us to enter the problem areas of our society with both a realistic assessment of their seriousness and a measured sense of hope regarding their probable solution. This should not only guide what we plan academically, but also keep us sane while we do it.

In the midst of all our problems, not least the financial ones, it seems to me we need more than ever to make clear to our society that the Christian faith makes a difference in life and that we must

operate our colleges in such a way that this is evident. If we don't, our besetting problems will perhaps devour us. And, perhaps they should.

C. A college must choose its priorities carefully.

No college can do everything. A Lutheran college is limited in what it can do. Today's rapidly rising costs, if nothing else, should lead us to a careful selectivity of the types of things we do.

Knowledge is prior to its application. Earlier I said I believed that education these days should escape the ivied halls and, at least in part, take place "out there." This is true. But we must be careful to distinguish between those off-campus experiences which assist in the learning process and those which are the inadequate attempts to apply knowledge to the ills of society.

Our students are idealists. They like to work in the inner-city, help the poor and handicapped and contribute to the solution of the race problem. All this is good. But in the name of collegiate education we must not regard humanitarian efforts as the same thing as academic work. And we must avoid at all costs sending out students to be practitioners on the ills of society before they are knowledgeable in the field.

> One criticism that is sometimes made of our colleges is that they do not offer a "practical" education. If by this is meant the skill-training needed to perform certain tasks, this is true. But here we must recognize the priority of knowledge over its application. And the former is our chief business.

The one thing colleges should be able to do better than other institutions in society is the intellectual work which lies back of and undergirds all other work which aims to change and improve society. To forsake an emphasis on quality in this area is to fail to be a college regardless of what other "good" work we might accomplish.

Programs Serve Goals

We must also remember that *goals precede programs.* The latter serve the former. There are so many things crying to be done in our society. Each of us can do something. But we must first decide what it is we are trying to achieve with and for our students and then structure programs. Some of them will directly involve specific social problems. Some of them will rather equip students for later effective leadership.

This should remind us that *persons must be educated before society can be changed.* Our chief role is to do the former. Hopefully it will result in the latter. The better a person understands himself, the society of which he is a part and the ways to go about healing society's

ills the better, and sooner, he will be in a position to become an influence for social betterment.

It is hard to measure the results of our work in this manner. If we were to examine ourselves carefully, however, we would no doubt discover that we have often been less effective than we should have been in equipping our students with the knowledge and the motivation which leads to effective citizenship.

Another priority we should never forget is that *programs and goals matter more than structures.* None of us needs to be reminded of how difficult it is to change a college department, or graduation requirements, or the college calendar, or numerous other rules of the game in our colleges. Some kind of a sacred aura protects the "way we have done it before."

> In a recent address John Gardner criticizes America generally and its leaders and institutions in particular for being more willing to seek private or self-serving goals than the proper goals of our whole society. "The species is in danger of extinction", he says.

What can colleges do? Colleges with self-chosen goals and purposes rooted in the Gospel have a serious responsibility to answer this question in ways which serve contemporary human needs.

A 3-Year Program?

How about a three-year program leading to the baccalaureate degree? Granted that the quantity of human knowledge is greater than ever and academic specialization refined to a highly sophisticated degree, may it not be proper for a college of "liberal learning" to reason realistically with the fact that undergraduate education ought to introduce a student to his own education rather than trying to help him complete it? If we were to be truly imaginative I believe we could offer the student the opportunity to accomplish the basic goals of a liberal education in less than four years.

I see these goals as being:

1) **A command of the skills of using and understanding language and styles of thought.**
2) **An organized knowledge of the history of human ideas and events.**
3) **An introductory acquaintance with specialized areas of knowledge.**
4) **An exposure to the great themes of human history including the Christian view of life and man.**

In order to do this we would need to make some drastic changes in our programs. I would suggest we do away with courses in English grammar and composition and substitute proficiency exams. High schools should, and often do, offer sufficient courses in this area and we could require students to attain minimum proficiency in reading and writing before entering college. Tutor systems, special summer work or other methods could be set up, if necessary, to take care of special needs.

I would also suggest we do away with introductory courses in foreign language. Most students dislike them and few go on to achieve a practical command of a second or third language. For those who wish to do this, elementary language work could be required for admission or provision could be made for it outside of the regular curriculum.

I suggest also that we get more serious about extracting first courses in many other fields from the curriculum. History, English, sociology, and other courses usually start with material most students have been exposed to before even though they may not have gained a command of it. There was a day when algebra and geometry were taught in college. Now a student must be considerably beyond those courses or he can't take college math. Other course areas could follow suit.

Every college student should also have some exposure to either foreign study or work in American social problem areas. Such "on-site" experiences enlarge the student's over-all educational perspective and tie him in to the world of which he is a part.

Why do these things? Because one of the problems we increasingly face is the prolonging of the full participation in society by the young. We need their ideas and activity earlier than we get them in our total functioning as a culture. Also because our society is pushing the young along faster than ever to be responsible, participating citizens. Undoubtedly one reason for youthful restlessness today is the built-in delay most of them experience in becoming a part of society through the sixteen or more years of formal education we expect of more and more of them.

D. A college needs to select carefully those areas of direct involvement where it seeks to effect change in society.

But it does need to select some areas!

Traditionally we have all accepted as one of our roles the pre-seminary education of future pastors. In this we have served our churches, and hopefully, society as well. Many of us have educated future teachers and we have geared into social work programs and pre-professional courses of all kinds to say nothing of home economics and agriculture and engineering.

> In our day we need seriously to ask ourselves whether there are specific areas of social concern which can be brought directly into our program. We all seek to assist disadvantaged students. That's good.

Are we now at the place where we should consider specific programs that tie in with urban or rural problems or with environmental problems? Could we encourage faculty members more than we have to become directly involved with governmental programs seeking to better our society so that they can not only make that direct contribution, but also bring back to their teaching the results of such experience.

One area, not widely developed among us, is that of learning the process of decision-making. Our students are eager these days to help us decide college policy. Much good to the college and to the student can come from this. But instead of simple involvement do we not need to be conscious of the need for education in the whole process of problem-solving and decision making? The tried and true American systems of debate, dialogue and adversary confrontation work, but our graduates of the future must improve on these elemental techniques if masses of people are to be moved willingly and knowingly in the direction of social problem solving. Our campuses could become meaningful laboratories of such activity if we could find a way through the partisan spirit which so often identifies campus issues with "the faculty" or "the administration" or "the students."

> Some groups in our society have informed us that they have given up on the possibility of peaceful change. They are committed to revolution and to violence. Colleges should be expected to be resources for the development of rational discourse used most effectively for social good.

In some of my moments of dreaming (or nightmare!) I wonder if the future will see the re-structuring of American higher education on the basis of specialties. In 1862 the Morrill Act spawned the greatest single example of specialty institutions our country has known. Most of the land-grant institutions have now come to be much like other universities and to a great degree have lost their distinctiveness. The future could possibly hold some new government program which would subsidize certain specialized programs. Lutheran colleges should not dismiss this kind of a future from their own planning.

Substitute for College

Should we not also be in the forefront of efforts to accomplish another goal of society? That is the establishment and acceptance of proper substitutes for a college education.

As long as we nurture the idea that "everybody" should go to college or that colleges should do "everything," we will have increasing problems in adapting college education to society's needs. Church colleges could serve a useful role if they were to help our society rid itself of the psychology which says that the college graduate group is the elite group.

I believe that within the pattern of specialization I dreamed of there could well develop institutions designed to meet defined needs of individuals and of society in such a way that the liberal arts college as a "specialized" institution would no longer need to think of itself as a "pre-" anything college. It would instead serve its proper role of providing a liberal education for a certain portion of the citizenry who would be equipped to play roles appropriate to those with such an education.

E. A college should not forget that it is the product and a part of its society as well as its maker. It is itself, therefore, subject to change.

Our friend, Dr. Edgar Carlson, formerly President of Gustavus Adolphus College and now the Executive Director of the Minnesota Private College Council, has suggested recently that the distinction between public and private colleges has been blurred by recent developments and that we need to take a new look at this distinction.

The colleges of this Conference need to re-think their futures in the light of what society is and is becoming. There needs to be with all of us a willingness to be changed. If we can be better servants of society by changes in our structures or programs, we should not only be willing to be so changed, but we should seek such change. The day may come when the Lutheran college as we have known it will not be an adequate instrument of the Church or of society to carry on a program of higher education. To insist that we will not change may be a courageous position to take. But it could also be our death knell!

> There is no doubt but that we are headed for a period of greater involvement with government programs. Whether they be student aid, institutional grants, project subsidies, capital programs or contractual arrangements, there is not much doubt but that we will be more and more involved.

As this takes place the question will be whether we will simply adapt to the planning done by others (perhaps because financial need will dictate such a course of action) or whether we will consciously choose our path on the basis of convictions regarding the manner in which we can best serve society.

The concept of service, though well-worn, is still more than a cliche. It describes best the role of a college of the Church. But to this idea must be added another, that of "creator" or "contributor" or "maker." In our proper humility we must not lose sight of the fact that we do not even serve best if we do it all from a picture of submission and acceptance. Colleges like ours have an obligation to be of influence, to seek to change what is into something better.

IV.

But what if the sum of all this is not a better world? Work as we must and adapt where necessary to a changing society, what if "progress" is not our lot?

As we said at the start, man has often been too sanguine about his own efforts, not least in education. What if "change" does not mean "improvement?"

Well, we're still a part of it!

But more than that. It seems to me it is precisely here that we need the faith and commitment to eternal truths which we say are at the base of all we do. As Christians we live in hope knowing we do not build Utopia. We work at human betterment knowing that such betterment may be slight or elude us altogether.

This culture, this society, may not be saved. As colleges we may not be saved. But if we fail it must not be because we did not know the nature of our times or lacked the will and faith to do what we knew should be done.

COMMENTARY

PRESIDENT JOSEPH L. KNUTSON
Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota

We got copies of Dr. Rand's speech in advance, so I had opportunity to go over it several times and then hear his adequate summary today. I think he has touched down on all the essentials and problems which are really facing us or plaguing us.

He mentions that change is not always beneficial. Maybe by nature I'm conservative. But sometimes I'm perturbed because the present mood seems to be that if anything is new, it's better. I have to remind myself that the kingdom of heaven is like unto a householder who brings forth from his treasure things new and things old. We aren't always admonished to try the new either. For the Word tells us that sometimes we should seek out the old paths and walk in them and that we should be a restorer of the breach.

> He referred to the pressure that is placed upon our institutions so that they all become alike. This is something that has bothered me for years. In fact, some time ago when I wrote on this, I mentioned that our American institutions of higher learning are becoming as alike as peas in a pod.

He referred to Dr. Edgar Carlson's observations about the distinctions between private and state institutions being blurred. Now don't we hear this all the time from our natural constituencies? What's the difference? Why should I pay more money to send my child to your institution? Do you have anything about your institution that is distinctive?

Now Dr. Rand proposes some things here for change. One is this three-year program. And I smiled when I read that because I have been in a lot of faculty meetings, too. Then can we do what we *want* to do? I don't think we can anymore. I remember several meetings of the Association of American Colleges when we were told in no uncertain terms: "absolutely not, have nothing to do with NCATE." Most of us in the private college world obeyed until one day we were rudely awakened by the fact that 21 state legislatures had decreed that there would be no reciprocity between states, so far as the teaching profession was concerned, if the graduates had not come from institutions which were NCATE approved.

So we all humbled ourselves and immediately met the requirements, and got on the bandwagon. Now many of our institutions are still turning

out a large proportion of teachers and our requirements from the college itself, for we still have a lot of liberal arts purists, and I say thank God for this, are so stringent that it is almost impossible for the student to get the educational requirements that are demanded by the state departments of education.

Dr. Rand mentioned that the accrediting agencies are putting this pressure on us. A few years ago Rev. Colman Barry, president of St. John's University at Collegeville, which is the largest Benedictine institution in America, wrote a history of that institution. St. John's didn't get North Central Accreditation until the middle 50's. There was a big debate on whether it should become accredited by the North Central and Rev. Barry mentions the time when President Lars Boe of St. Olaf went to the institution and pleaded with it not to seek North Central Accreditation. He pointed out the large number of Catholic institutions and asked St. John's to take the leadership in setting up an accrediting agency for their own Roman Catholic institutions.

> Now in all fairness I want to say that North Central has been the most liberal and farsighted of these accrediting institutions. Back in the early 50's we had the Gustafson effort—he was president of the University of Nebraska—to do away with all extra-territorial accrediting agencies, and there was meeting after meeting held on this to break the hold of American Chemical Society, A.A.U.W., etc., upon the American institutions of higher learning. But that didn't get very far either, though there is a commission left from this that you may appeal to if you think that some of these extra-territorial accrediting agencies are getting a little too rough.

Well, just how are we to be different? One thing that bothers me a lot today is the fact that as church colleges we have a theology back of us. I like to quote Dr. Stoughton from Wittenberg, a layman who said something significant when he would cry out, "We don't have a philosophy of education but we have a theology of education." I think that is stating it well. For after all, theology and philosophy do deal with the same basic questions. And, it's really the answering of these questions which is the essence of a liberal arts education. But are we getting our ideology or theology over?

Now I don't want to be too critical of my own faculty. But here is where I think we fail, even in our departments of religion. For, after all, in our Luthern colleges our teachers, nearly all of them, have come from post-graduate institutions, even post-graduate seminaries, which are not Lutheran. And then we have to face up to the fact that nearly all the new teachers we are getting have come out of institutions where

these so-called philosophical or theological questions have never been raised.

> **Well, how are we going to implement our ideology or our theology? And, if we don't do this, I don't see that there is much significance in our flying the banner of the Church.**

This statement from Dr. Stephen Tonsor I think is very significant. When I read his speech that President Anderson sent out (I think most of you got it), from the Augsburg Centennial, I was so impressed with it that I called and asked for permission to have it mimeographed and sent out to our faculty. I don't know anything that I have sent out to the faculty that has received a better response. He not only mentions this ideological factor but also talks about our style of life. Now some will say Knutson's pietistic background is coming out.

Not too many years ago a Missouri Synod theologian by the name of Theodore Graebner wrote a book called *The Borderline*. Now I doubt very much that anyone would write that kind of book today. And I think it's too bad because we are not facing up to the way a Christian should live in this world. The kind of stance we take over against the world. We have forgotten almost entirely a good Luthern doctrine called the 3rd use of the law, chapter 16, of the Formula of Concord, which I think answers nearly every question ever raised by situation ethics and all this emphasis on love which has brought us into the new heresy of perfectionism, which is plaguing us today. And also we have overlooked almost entirely the Luthern doctrine of the freedom of the Christian man. We may stress one part of it, but we are no longer concerned about our relationship with our neighbor and what we are doing with him.

> Then one more observation. Dr. Rand spoke about specialty institutions. When I read this I thought about a prophesy I made some time ago that maybe our institutions of higher learning will be done away with entirely in a few years, and maybe a few less years than we expect. We've had this emphasis on separating all military research from institutions of higher learning. Now this has been done in several of the topnotch universities.

Well, just carry this on a few steps further. Some of us a few years back were down at the IBM plant at Rochester—that's really a university. They are going to school all the time while they are manufacturing their computers. The Olin Company is another that has started classes, even on the elementary level up to the highest branches of higher education, right in their factories! I think we are going to see a continuation of this very thing. So we might have specialty education after awhile, and I

think this is bound in some way to affect what we are doing today.

But I can't help but feel that our institutions will always be needed if we are true to our fundamental purpose. I like to think that so far as our own American Luthern Church is concerned that outside our congregations our institutions of higher learning had more to do with its growth, achievement and influence than any other one thing. The Church could get along without its institutions of higher learning—I think we would have to grant that—but I don't think it would be the same kind of church.

When we are talking about change, and I agree with Dr. Rand that the format that ties us to the Church may change, it may not be the same that it has always been. Still it is something that has to be kept very vital. And I think right now we are in the very heart of this problem.

COMMENTARY

JEFF JOHNSON
Associate Professor of Sociology
Valparaiso University

Today, when you ask a Black person to show up at a meeting and react, more and more the expectation is that he will show up with an Afro, natural, or bush, wearing a dashiki and not infrequently using the idiom of the "street nigger." I've tried an Afro and found that it really doesn't "take" on all Black people. I own a dashiki, but have only worn it once. I can use the idiom of the street niggah, but fear that it really wouldn't be understood.

First of all, President Rand, the ability to develop an adequate educational strategy in the times in which we find ourselves, is going to hinge on a prior ability to identify with some degree of accuracy what is going on now and the direction our society will take in the near and possibly distant future. And for whatever it's worth, I should like to compliment you for identifying a number of the elements of our situation.

One way of organizing and understanding what it is we are confronted with is one of those concepts which you rightfully pointed out doesn't have a very good reputation. I refer to the concept of "evolution," which especially seems to cause church-related people of our persuasion some problems. To be more specific, I am referring to socio-cultural evolution.

While defining our situation in terms of "social change" does enable us to avoid some of the vain pretension implicit in the concept of progress," to define our situation as a case of "social change" also precludes looking at the full range of what has happened and is now happening in Western Civilization. Too frequently, defining the course of Western Civilization as a case of "social change" really constitutes little more than a "social problems" approach to the nature of life in which we can isolate a number of the elements that go to make up that life, but which does not enable us to see how those elements are related to each other, nor does it enable us to engage in any kind of meaningful interpretation of them, other than in a mildly negative way.

> If we are the beneficiaries of socio-cultural evolution, then what we have recently experienced and will experience takes on an entirely different meaning. We would recognize (at this point) that whatever strategies we come up with are tentative and subject to change. And if we are serious about developing strategies,

then we in academia would also be serious about tooling up to understand what it is we have to deal with.

Perhaps the point can be made by referring to your remarks about "attitudes and values." One can seriously question the fact that "the fundamentals" are up for grabs. What is less questionable (working within the context of socio-cultural evolution) is that the conditions in which man currently exists have so radically changed that we are simply faced with new moral problems.

It is quite true that students one hundred years ago were not doing some of the things that they're doing today. But then, one hundred years ago, students weren't faced with the question that students are faced with today, namely, should I devote my time, and energy and skill to develop new techniques for killing human beings as the price for getting a college education. And there is good reason to believe that the moral questions one hundred years from now will be even more different than they are today. While the moral questions of today are quite different from those of yesterday, I am not altogether certain that this also means that "the fundamentals" are up for grabs.

Secondly, when we get to the question of social responsibility, social involvement and the kind of leadership you suggest, it would appear that we ought to begin with a very careful assessment of where we are right now, and why we are where we are with respect to those items. It would appear to me that we who work in Luthern colleges have not been, nor are we now the servants of society. Rather, we have been and largely continue to be the servants of a privileged class.

If, President Rand, you are referring to a wider social service and a wider social responsibility, we had better face the fact that such efforts are going to run into serious difficulties with our constituencies, difficulties not unlike those encountered in desegregating American life. So far as our constituencies are concerned, a college education is still one of the most important avenues to success. If we start tampering with it, this is going to be a very serious threat to our constituencies and we shall get some very interesting reactions.

If, however, you insist on responsibility, service and leadership, then I don't think we need ask "where do we start?" The answer is too obvious. We have no right to go "there" and do something we are not willing to do in our own midst. In fact, we will not accomplish anything "out there" if we don't first of all accomplish it in our own midst.

If we are serious about serving the total society, then our boards of directors, our faculties and our student bodies ought to be representative

of that total society. Until we include such people in all areas of academic life (and by that their persons, not just their interests) it would seem that this talk about service, leadership and responsibility is going to be nothing more than a myth, by which we (and we alone) are deluded. Outside this context, our theology will continue to be what it frequently has been in the past, namely, rather empty rhetorical re-inforcement.

Some of your suggestions, President Rand, about changing the curriculum are thoroughly exciting and one wishes that we could get at them immediately.

What's So Special About a Lutheran College?

LOUIS ALMÉN

Ideologically, the church-related college is a type of Christendom in the sphere of higher education. For some persons this represents an antiquated, discredited, counter-productive relation between the church and the world of higher education today. The acceptance of a secularized education as the governing reality is advocated by church college critics.

There is a story in the development of the theme for this speech which, if told, will I hope put the announced topic in contemporary perspective. The first conversations outlining my assignment indicated that I was to attempt to chart the future of Lutheran junior colleges through the seventies. After a few days of reflection, I retreated from that task because I considered it to be too risky. The dozens of contingencies needing to be evaluated and reliably estimated to honestly make ten-year projections were beyond my available time and resources. For a while it appeared that I would be unable to accept this invitation to speak.

At that point, in conversations the topic was reduced to an area hopefully lying within my competence and responsibility. The suggestion was made that the future orientation needed to be kept but that the future perspective could be limited to the church's expectations of its colleges in the next decade. In some ways I thought this narrower topic to be within my powers if I could simply project the conclusions of the Council on the Mission of LCA Colleges and Universities. With these conclusions I was familiar and in agreement.

Further reflection, however, revealed that the Council statement was not phrased in the language of expectations as much as in the phraseology of mission. The basic thrust of that document is found in its delineation of the educational mission of the colleges. It is on the basis of that unique mission that the expectations of both church and college are projected. I determined that a speech about the unique educational mission of Lutheran colleges would be in order and could conceivably make a contribution to future planning.

Define Mission

This speech, then, has developed through several stages, from reflection on a ten-year projection to an attempt to state the unique educational

mission of Lutheran colleges. Hopefully, this will be both safer and more helpful. I should point out that definition of mission is the primary task in planning for the future. The more rapid the changing circumstances, the more important it is to have clearly in mind the character of the educational mission we are trying to preserve and promote. Skaters who whirl, I am told, need to keep their eyes fixed on a base point with each turn or they soon suffer the disorientation of dizziness. The same appears to be true in these times of rapid social change for educators, churchmen and all citizens. Unless we frequently take a sighting on our goal, we are easily disoriented.

> In short, I hope to show you how Biblical theology and Lutheran thought do provide specific and special insights into what it means to know, into the character of the learning process and the meaning of service. It is assumed here that what the church expects of the colleges related to it is to give institutional expression to these insights. The fact is that the colleges related to the Lutheran Church do in substantial ways give expression to these Biblical and Lutheran insights and are in that important sense very special institutions.

Lutheran colleges are special in other ways too. Compared to most educational institutions, they have remained small enough to preserve a sense of community, an important factor in an educational philosophy which puts primary emphasis upon the growth of the individual. Lutheran colleges also have distinguished musical traditions, a strong emphasis upon the humanities and excellent under-graduate preparation for all but the most esoteric academic fields. Each Lutheran college, furthermore, has a unique history and development making it a distinctive institution. The particular importance of the *special* character of its educational mission is that this distinctiveness is pervasive, belonging to the controlling purpose of the institution.

I. What it Means to Know

What does it mean to know? This is the root question of education. Currently, we are in a communications revolution with three rather contrasting movements, each relating to the question of what it means to know. The three are:

1) greatly improved information retrieval systems
2) linguistic analysis
3) non-verbal communication.

Louis Almén is Executive Secretary, Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Church in America.

Each of these movements has made an impact upon curricula.

The proponents of each of these movements operate from value assumptions about knowledge. The information enthusiasts, for example, would answer the question of what it means to know by inferring that knowing basically means access to all available information. Linguistic analysts, on the other hand, assert that a person knows when he has applied rigid epistemological guidelines and has the proper verifiable referents for words or symbols. The non-verbal communicators, assured that they have their fingers on the human pulse, assert among other things, that you really know when you "feel" with another human being and sit with him in his situation.

Each of these knowledge "philosophies" has curricular application. The information retrieval enthusiasts seek to introduce courses in computer use and search for methods of transforming existing courses through the application of new information systems. Linguistic analysts have pre-empted philosophy in many places and seek to use their methodologies to increase precision in the use of language and the development of knowledge systems. The non-verbal communicators promote "involvement" courses and occasionally insert the use of sensitivity groups in speech or psychology to break through "rationalizations" and expose man as he really is.

The Biblical Understanding of Knowledge

The Bible offers its own understanding of what it means to know. The Greek word, "gnosis," in the New Testament reveals five levels or aspects of the Biblical understanding of what it means to know.[1] The first three levels the Bible shares with Greek thought; the last two are unique to the New Testament. The first level of knowing is to know fact. Without facts a reality picture is not possible. However, facts alone do not give real understanding. To really *know,* it is necessary to move to the second level, to the level of idea. Ideas are the patterns in which facts make sense. And it goes without saying that a good education is one in which the student develops a fund of critically analyzed ideas. But ideas themselves come in patterns. Some are more important than others; some are prior; some are more comprehensive, and so on. The patterns in which ideas take shape constitute level three, systems or philosophies.

With educators, I'm sure, the insight has not been lost that in these three levels we have a good definition of the intellectual core of a liberal arts education. Some junior college educators do not even seek to achieve all three levels of the Greek understanding of what it means to know, because their orientation is primarily on the vocational rather than on the humanities. However, church-related junior college education requires

level three because level three interacts creatively with level four in the Biblical understanding of what it means to know. It is in the context of the quest for the meaning of life that the Gospel first begins to make sense. Further, it is in the process of putting together a larger view of life that a Christian philosophy of life can take shape.

> Level four of the meaning of *gnosis* is that you do not really know until you know Him in Whom all things hold together. You may indeed have thought about the meaning of life without Him, but when you know Him, He becomes the center of that meaning and other realities or ideas are judged in relationship to Him. Thus, you see, level three and level four are interactive. If through confrontation by the Gospel, Love becomes the controlling guide for all conduct, that is a basis for building a philosophy of life. Other things are evaluated in reference to it.

It should be said that knowing Him as Lord and Saviour is not an exercise in syllogistic thought, although reason is essential in making sense out of life in terms of His primacy. Knowing Him as Lord and Savior can best be spoken of in the existential terms of confronting One who makes us His own. In Luther's explanation to the third article of the Apostle's Creed, the existential character of belief is stated as follows: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him, but the Holy Spirit has called me through the Gospel, enlightened me by his gifts." This refers to a Reality perceived in the process of confrontation by the Gospel, a Reality which is affirmed by the Christian and held with conviction.

Truth Must Possess You

You do not *really know* in the Biblical understanding of knowledge until you know Him in Whom all things hold together; Him Who is Logos, the One through whom all things have been made and toward whom all things tend.

> **The final level of *gnosis* is that you do not really know until the truth possesses you. In Christian terms God is Love and man cannot be said to know God Who is Love until he loves. The truth must possess you before you *really* know. Knowing in the end involves doing. Thought and action become one integrated movement.**

Only a moment's reflection is required to realize that the church *does* have a *specific, fundamental, definable* idea of what it means to know. Further, it is obvious that this graduated and inclusive understanding of what it means to know does not exclude any of the current communica-

tion movements listed earlier and that, positively, it helps to put them in perspective without violating their integrity. The church's reasonable expectation of its colleges, then, is the development of the five levels of what it means to know from the Biblical understanding.

II. Lutheran Theology and the Character of Learning

Knowing is the central core of education; but education is more than knowing if it is defined in its most narrow intellectual sense. Learning is a process, an educational process, which in itself has values both to the individual and to society, values such as perseverance or the acceptance of discipline.

The learning process of education has been described from several specific perspectives. For instance, from the individual's standpoint, learning is a maturation process by which the individual is enabled to become his best self. Education is, from this perspective, the means by which the individual develops his potential.

Educators also frequently view education as a socializing process. The classroom is a micro-society in which the person learns how to relate successfully with other people. It is an important means by which society prepares the young for good citizenship. The extra-curricular activities in the school are also consciously promoted for their socializing value.

As recent demands for Black culture courses have reminded us, education is an acculturating process. Through it we learn of our ethnic roots and in this way more clearly define who we are. This kind of education is intimately associated with the family and to a certain extent the church. But formal education has been asked to assume a major role in promoting the historical and cultural understanding necessary for the appreciation of our sub-cultures. As Lutherans we know much about education as an acculturating force from our own strongly ethnic backgrounds. Lutheran colleges continued to contribute significantly as acculturating agents.

Education is Social Salvation

Today, surely more than in the past, education is a *fixing* process as educators are drafted to use their expertise in solving social problems of pressing concern. In fact, education is seen by many as the means to social salvation. Recent interpretations of American higher education view it as the central institution of our contemporary society to which all the other major institutions—government, business, agriculture—look for leadership. As rapid change makes old ways obsolete, the expertise gained through mastery of a field of knowledge is required to establish new, viable systems.

All these aspects of the learning process—maturation, social-

> ization, acculturation—are a part of college education. However, the church, recognizing these contributions, expects more of its colleges in the learning process. Just as education can be the means by which an individual is socialized or acculturated, it can and ought to be the means by which the individual can grow in faith as he learns.

A fundamental Biblical perspective has to do with the understanding of the presence of God in the world. The New Testament speaks of Christ as everywhere present. In Ephesians Paul speaks of Christ's ascent into heaven in these words, "That he might fill all things." Luther, defining how Christ fills all things, did not confuse things with Christ but indicated that Christ was a type of consubstantial spiritual reality, in, with, and under all things.

The world is a mask of God, who becomes visible to faith and is happily enjoyed in His creation. Learning from this perspective can be spoken of as similar to "stereo communication" in which spirit and things, though separate, interact creatively and joyfully, needing each other to be fulfilled. Outstanding examples of this approach to scholarship, such as Tielhard de Chardin, are models of a holistic style of learning which seeks "whole" visions, resists reductionism, and creatively relates spirit and matter. Christ, the Logos, the Alpha and the Omega, is effectively related to His Creation in that style of learning which is a type of "stereo communication."

Two Communities

Another concept uniquely appropriate to a theological understanding of the learning process has to do with the relation between church and world. Augustine wrote about the City of God and the City of Man; and Luther, approaching the subject in a different age and from a somewhat different perspective, spoke of the two kingdoms. Both theologians recognized the separateness and the interdependence of the two communities. The City of God existed within the City of Man and was to a certain extent dependent upon the larger community; yet, its true life was derived from that Perfect Reality dwelling in, with, and under time and space.

The Community of Faith, a community of sinners who acknowledge their acceptance by the Perfect Reality, gives visible expression to the City of God and has the responsibility of witnessing to that Reality in the City of Man in order that the City of Man may grow toward perfection. The two communities are related in ways which make them dependent upon one another. The political kingdom provides law and order and the spiritual kingdom enlivens the will to mutual service,

peace and personal fulfillment. This is the rationale of Christendom wherein both spheres acknowledge and support one another.[2]

Ideologically, the church-related college is a type of Christendom in the sphere of higher education. For some persons this represents an antiquated, discredited, counter-productive relation between the church and the world of higher education today. The acceptance of a secularized education as the governing reality is advocated by church college critics. This is what Harvey Cox suggests in *The Secular City,* for example. The role that Cox sees for the church in higher education is the prophetic function of criticism and the priestly service of group reconciliation.

These are traditional roles and no one can quarrel with them. Furthermore, in the public universities in the USA where official identification with religion is forbidden, the church must adapt its ministry to the limitations of the situation. The church, however, need not give up its larger role in church-related private education simply because the majority of students are enrolled in universities which are officially indifferent to religious values.

Faith and Life Fructified

The church-related college deliberately seeks to keep the "community of faith" and the "community of learning" (the academic versions of the City of God and the City of Man) in creative interaction. It is in this process that the church's faith and life can be fructified by all avenues of learning; and conversely, it is in this close association that the church's insights into the nature of man and community can be vitally incorporated into the arts, humanities and sciences. As group speaks to group, changes take place in each and both are served.[3]

While the Lutheran Church holds to a two kingdom theology, it has never given its imprimatur to a particular polity or church/society relationship. It has tended to judge all structures by their fruitfulness. The church college is an institutional expression of a form of two kingdom relationship in which there is formal support for both kingdoms with expected fruitful interaction between them. It has the formal advantage of a supportive environment and has played a tremendous role in fostering a theologically informed laity. Its success, however, depends upon the vitality of both the community of faith and community of learning.

III. The Meaning of Service

The third topic, service, is perhaps closest to the theme of this conference and is, I think, the place at which the current demand for relevance most frequently focuses. Faculty, students, civic leaders, Black power groups, and others sense the urgency of turning the expertise of the university to the task of solving current social problems. They want

the academic man to serve the pressing needs of the day. Public service has never been alien to higher education, but today it has become an insistent demand.

At the same time as these entreaties for service are coming from outside, the academic community has been undergoing some changes which have modified the climate for service within the institution. Students have pushed administrators to the extreme, creating adversary roles for both sides. As this has developed, the trend toward unionization of faculties has tended to decrease professionalism on the one hand and on the other hand to establish contract limitations upon the intellectual and personal services of the professor. (I here note a tendency and do not wish these comments to be interpreted as a stance for or against unionization.)

> From all external appearances these campus developments have irritated the academic working situation and diminished professional motivation. They may even have sent many academics packing for more agreeable working surroundings. Service to students by faculty and administration will very likely require greater personal sacrifice in the foreseeable future. Campus conflict has pulled down the ivy from the towers.

The Christian concept of *diakonia* gains particular pertinence in this situation. In the New Testament *diakonia* defines a type of service which has its prototype in Christ. In Philippians 2:4-9 Paul explains how the Christ emptied himself in order to raise man to his fullness. "Though he was in the form of God, he did not think it a thing to be grasped but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant." The constraining phrase for the Christian in this famous passage is in the introductory words, "Have this mind in you . . ."

A word study of *diakonia* in the New Testament also reveals that in addition to loving personal sacrifice there are two other elements in its meaning constellation. They are 1) service to the needy who have no claim on the one who serves even people who are far removed and unknown, and 2) identification with and involvement on behalf of the ones who are served.

First Deacons in Conflict

I do not mean to imply, by citing the unique understanding of service found in the Bible and in true Christianity, that Christian service excludes conflict or protest. Far from it, the first deacons in the Christian Church arose in response to a conflict. The pressures that divide men do not skip the church related colleges. Here, however, in the academic world there is a group of people taking seriously the injunction to have the

same mind in them as was in Christ. Another dimension to the "common life" is acknowledged; another healing, creative, community-building force is at work. It rubs off. It makes a difference.

The church expects that in the colleges related to it, colleges marked by religious vitality as well as excellence in the pursuit of arts and sciences, there will be a "lifting up" of servant roles. Such emphasis must arise out of the concern of the college community. Christian *diakonia* cannot be manufactured or coerced; it is a gift of the Spirit. Where found it is a generating and healing power. The love which serves is in itself a human fulfillment. "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The statements made in this address clearly indicate that the church expects its colleges to be independent educational institutions, which in their independence give educational expression to Biblical understandings of the nature of reality. I hope that what I have said has helped to answer the question, "What's so special about a Lutheran college?

FOOTNOTES

[1] The insights on the Biblical words used in this speech have been gained from study of the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and translated by Geoffry W. Bromilley—Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co.

[2] In no sense should this be considered an isolationist situation, since no one in our present society can be effectively shielded from the major issues of the day. Positively, this situation makes possible the development of a special resource for the birth of a theonomy, to use Tillich's term for the ideal relationship between Christ and culture.

[3] Leslie Newbigin in his book, *Honest Religion for Secular Man,* an SCM Paperback, develops a critique of various Christian responses to secularization and holds that education cannot fulfill its task on a secularized basis. Education is basically value-oriented and needs to develop a strong value orientation to be fully effective.

Higher Education Must Become Modern

C. C. COLVERT

There are some professors who are better researchers and writers than they are teachers. There are others who are better teachers than researchers, and a few who are good at both. All three types of professors are needed and should be encouraged through salary raises and promotions. We must give greater emphasis to good teaching.

There are many things wrong with our government, but it is still the best government in the world today. There are many ways in which higher education is deficient, yet ours is the best higher educational system among the nations of the world.

Business and industry are modernizing very rapidly. In fact, business and industry have kept a continuous modernization program in effect at a more rapid rate during the past twenty years than at any time in the history of our nation.

The jet age came into being during World War II. The outer space rocket age has developed within the past few years. All of these and other developments make our age the age of technology. This present age of developments has influenced all of our lives, our churches, our homes, our cities, our schools, and just about everything else.

Of course, everything is relative. The stagecoach was faster than the wagon, the car faster than the stagecoach, and the airplane was faster than the car. And now, we have rocket travel, a very fast and so far our safest mode of transportation, but still slower than the speed of light. Such comparisons remind me of the story of the snail who was riding on the back of the turtle. He exclaimed, "Whee"!!

Now let us turn our attention to higher education—college and university education. This is of interest to students, college faculties and administrators, and to the supporters of higher education, in fact all citizens. Citizens pay the bills for higher education as tax payers and/or church members.

There are five areas of higher education I would like to bring to your attention as important areas for modernization. There are many others, of course.

Modernize Libraries

The first is that of modernizing our libraries to become "Materials Instruction Centers," or "Resource Learning Centers." Until recently, libraries were the place where books, periodicals, maps, and music records were kept. Today we are modernizing our library services but not fast enough.

> The Resource Learning Center is the library and much more. It is excitingly much more. It is a challenging concept. It houses tapes of lectures by the professor for a particular course where the student can listen before class and after class if he desires. Possibly not all the lectures would be taped, but strategic ones where the student would benefit by such experiences.

There would be computer assisted instructional programs where the student would use programmed computers and teletypewriters to study questions and problems he should know, such problems as mathematics, history, languages, and any other discipline. These are subjects programmed to assist the student, in his learning, his critical thinking, and his judgments.

He can listen to plays, literature, music, great speeches, lectures from outside experts in his subject field through the miracle of electronics —right in the instructional Materials Center. All of these materials can be programmed—even television tapes, and can be commanded at will by the student or faculty member by dialing them by code numbers. Such procedures will enliven learning and teaching and can be wired into dormitory rooms or study areas. Student learning will be greatly enriched.

Library references on any subject can be programmed by way of the computer so that the student or faculty member can dial such a subejct and in succession, on a TV screen and/or print-out from a computer—all such material will be given to the student or faculty member. Such devices will give the student much more time for studying and for his research instead of so much time devoted to looking up references. Materials from libraries all over the world can be programmed for such use.

> This Materials Instruction Center will furnish the professor and the student with any and all types of mass media materials. Such will include, as stated, tapes, film strips, movies,

---

C. C. Colvert is Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, University of Texas.

> TV tapes, and variations of these. All of these are at the instant command of the professor and student through this Center.

Such a facility will need much more personnel to serve the faculty and students, such as programmers, media instrument repairmen, graphic artists, attendants for programmed learning centers, productionists, operators, and schedulers. These will cost money. It will be worth it because they will produce more efficient teaching and learning and decrease drop outs. As a result those who finance higher education will get more for their money.

Higher Education Needs the Best

The second area of modernization for discussion is that of the faculty. Former Governor LeRoy Collins of Florida, who did much to modernize higher education in his state, said, among other things, in a 1962 meeting of the Association for Higher Education in Chicago, that we are in an age of intellectual revolution. For this and other reasons higher education needs the best in research, the best in curriculum, and the best in faculty. A good faculty is most important. The Materials Instructional Center is the *heart* of the college or university but the faculty is the *soul* of it.

Henry W. Wriston, formerly president of Brown University and now president of the American Assembly, Columbia University, in an article titled, "Publish or Perish," in the *Saturday Review* about three years ago, state that it is hard to evaluate good teaching. He further states that student opinions concerning who is a good professor are uncertain. I do not agree completely with this last statement. By and large students do know who are good teachers. They do not know all of them because a few years from now additional professors may be added to the original list.

> Many of my colleagues in higher education do not agree with me, but I do not believe colleagues of professors and administrators should adopt the policy of "publish or perish." There are some professors who are better researchers and writers than they are teachers. There are others who are better teachers than researchers, and a few who are good at both. All three types of professors are needed and should be encouraged through salary raises and promotions. We must give greater emphasis to good teaching.

On the other hand, Wriston states in the same article quoted above that, "So far as effective instruction is concerned, those who do not publish do perish." An article titled "Education" in *Time Magazine*

of a few years ago has a statement that, "Most good teachers, in fact, cannot resist publishing: they have something they want to say to the world beyond the classrooms."

This is possibly true, yet a faculty member can also submit to in-service training as to better techniques of instruction, better use of mass media, techniques of grading, and many others. We must do more of this sort of thing just as medical doctors, lawyers, and some men of other professions do.

Speaking of good college professors, the above article in *Time* on ten outstanding college professors has a statement that:

> All ten of them (outstanding professors) have demonstrated sound scholarship through publication, all are immersed in a conviction that their scholarship has an irresistible relevance to life, and feel compelled to convey that relevance.
> All believe that insights, ideas, ways of thinking, methods of inquiry, are far more important to implant in young minds than any specific points of knowledge.

Another word to those who finance higher education: good faculty will cost more money—more money to keep good faculty members already in the employment of the college and to secure other needed good faculty members. On the other hand, such a type of faculty member will produce a better student for you out of your sons and daughters.

Boards of colleges and administrators more than ever and despite shortages of faculty members, must strive harder to secure top faculty members for our youth. We need such professors to offset the criticism which Dr. Vernon R. Alden, President of Ohio University, gives in an article in *Saturday Review* two years ago. He states, quote:

> **Too many of our brilliant students coming out of college today tend to be merely commentators, observers, and critics of society. We seem to have an oversupply of detached observers, young people who are skilled cocktail party conversationalists, and brilliant analysts of other peoples' activity and behavior. We have a great undersupply of young people who can and will take responsibility—"doers," innovators, and risk takers. So many young men and women from first rate colleges reveal an unwillingness to be fully committed. They seem reluctant to participate actively in the world in which they are living.**

Our thinking concerning the college professor can be concluded by stating that boards and administrators, including departmental heads and

their faculties, must search critically for faculty members who are not only proficient in their special field but must find such professional personnel who are amenable to learning about the use of mass media instructional materials and will use in-service training opportunities to improve their teaching techniques and a better understanding of the college students. The corollary to this is that boards and administrators must furnish this in-service training and mass media instructional materials including personnel to prepare needed materials and to operate the machines when and where needed. The doctors, lawyers and architects have many technicians who assist them, why not the college professor?

Institutional Research

The third area of modernization to be mentioned is in the field of institutional research. Colleges and universities must do more research inside the college, that is, internal research, or institutional research. All of you—all citizens and college officials and faculties—can see the need and advantage of such research. All going businesses and industrial firms do a great deal of research.

E. R. Carpenter, Director of Academic Research at Pennsylvania State University, stated recently that each higher educational institution itself must do constant institutional research to assist in long range planning. This is the current concept for colleges and universities.

He lists three planning problems:

> The first problem is to arrange for that order of planning steps which will provide for creative thinking and new concepts for solution to problems.
>
> The second problem as to how new educational theory concepts, and proposed educational theory, and proposed organizational changes can be judged for incorporation into new designs and then validated by research.
>
> Problem number three is that of establishing an adequate basis of dependable information for planning and of designing new institutions for adaptations to social changes and educational purposes.

Through institutional research scientific answers as to enrollment projections ten to fifteen years ahead, building needs of the different types and purposes, projected costs of these buildings, projected cost of the educational operation of the college, and faculty needs as to the number of additional members and the academic areas in which they are needed.

Also, as someone has said, we need to examine our present methods of admitting students to our colleges—we need a new definition of excellence. We need additional yardsticks to measure potential college students. We must find ways to identify such characteristics as motivation, creativity, imagination, and emotional maturity. We must find ways to challenge the average as well as the really oustanding students more than we seem to be doing today. Institutional research can assist in finding these answers.

Use of Faculty in Planning

The fourth area is that of college organization and administration. A simple statement of the problem is that we must use more faculty members and students on our committees and in the planning in our colleges.

Today faculty members are professional people. As such we must treat them as professionals. They teach and do research in higher education. Their judgment today is based upon very sound knowledge, interest in the college and the student.

> As a result we should have faculty members not only manning our faculty committees as they do now but also as representatives of the faculty on administrative committees, such as faculty personnel, finances, budgets, fund raising, and administrative organizations, such as administrative councils, or the equivalents. We should have faculty members on student recruitment committees.

It seems that when faculty members know more about their college, they are more willing and able to support the college and to assist in overcoming its shortcomings, such as faculty, finances and the like.

Likewise, students should have the privilege of having representative membership on most all, if not all, committees of the college, possibly without vote. There are some committees on which students should have vote. These have to do with all matters pertaining directly to students themselves.

> **A note of caution: It seems that when many of the faculties and students organize into associations and select representatives for subgroups and committees that a small minority group within each will maneuver to elect the president or chairman and representatives from this minority group and such are not representative of the faculty or students.**

Sometimes I think that no representative of the faculty or students should be so designated unless one more than half of the total of each

group votes for this representation. Even if 75 per cent of the group is a voting quorum and a majority vote is one more than half, then out of 100 votes 75 could be a quorum and 38 a majority vote, for election. Such a procedure permits 38 per cent to elect its representatives. The above *is* a note of caution.

Serve the Church

The fifth and last area is not one in need of so much modernization as it is one in need of greater emphasis. This is the area of service to the Church which supports the college.

I firmly believe that the denominational college has a very important place in higher education in this country. They are needed as a catalytic agent to even public colleges. The denominational college can do certain things that the public college cannot do but needs to be done.

> The denominational college must increase its emphasis on the idea of greater service to its Church and its membership. The denominational college can stress openly the principles of church doctrine. It can teach the Bible not only as literature but as its denomination intereprets it. It can teach its church history. The curriculum, in other words, can be constructed so as better to serve the Church. The college can set up programs for training church secretaries, church workers, church and business managers. It can set up conferences for ministers, laymen, church workers, and Sunday School teachers on and off the campus.

I would like to see greater expansion of extension services of the denominational colleges to pastors, Sunday School teachers, missionaries, and the laymen in any of the fields taught in the colleges, including academic subjects. Such services could include courses for the in-service training of pastors and all other religious workers.

The denominational college should constantly strive to better serve its clientele—all of the people of its denomination.

There are many other areas in higher education which are in need of modernization, as anything does which makes progress. Other areas could be student personnel, faculty ratings, merit raises, and research versus teaching, to mention a few.

And now may I say that it is a real pleasure to be here. You are most challenging and I think private higher has a special place in all of higher education.

May God bless you.

LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

56th ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA EDUCATIONAL STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

SATURDAY, JANUARY 10

9:00 a.m.
Meeting of Executives, Boards of College Education and Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the USA

Seminary Session, Castillian A

10:00—5:00 p.m.
7:00—9:30 p.m.
Meeting of Presidents
Staff Service: Dr. Donald W. Herb Executive Secretary, Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the USA
(Coffee served at 3:00 p.m., Dinner not scheduled)

Junior College Session, Castillian B

Dr. Ernest D. Nielsen, presiding
3:00—5:00 p.m.
Speaker: Dr. C. C. Colvert, Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, University of Texas
6:00 p.m.
Dinner, Venetian Room
Speaker: Dr. Louis Almen, Executive Secretary, Board of College Education and Church Vocations, Lutheran Church in America

Board of Directors
6:00 p.m.
Dinner meeting, Walnut Room

SUNDAY, JANUARY 11

General Sessions, Castillian Room
Dr. Sidney A. Rand, presiding
1:00 p.m.
First Session, Luncheon
Lina R. Meyer Lecture: Dr. Sidney A. Rand, "Educational Strategies for Social Change"
3:00 p.m.
Second Session
Commentators: Dr. Joseph L. Knutson, President, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota
Dr. Harold Haas, Dean of the College, Wagner College
Dr. Jeff Johnson, Associate Professor of Sociology, Valparaiso University
General Discussion on Theme
5:00 p.m.
Business Meeting

The
ANNUAL REPORT
of the
SECRETARY-TREASURER
THE LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF NORTH AMERICA

Shamrock Hilton, Houston, Texas January 11, 1970

This report is the second provided through staff services of the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the USA. The Board of Directors of this Conference in March 1968 elected the associate executive secretary of DES as its secretary-treasurer.

MEMBERSHIP

Institutional membership was reduced by one with the dissociation of Hartwick College, Oneonta, N. Y., from the Luthern Church in America and this Conference. There continue 14 seminaries, 14 junior colleges, 33 senior colleges and five church boards of education—college, higher or theological.

Further reduction in institutional membership is likely when the board of Michigan Lutheran College announces the change in ownership of MLC to Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.

An invitation to individuals for membership resulted in the addition of 29 members.

Upon his election as president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Dr. J. A. O. Preus, vice-president, resigned that position.

BUDGET

Attached as Exhibit A is an unaudited financial report, showing the budget and actual expenses. The Conference's records are presently under audit in the Treasurer's office of the Lutheran Council in the USA where accounting and record keeping is achieved. The audited statement will be provided the Board of Directors when it next meets.

Beginning January 1, 1969 with a balance of $7,877.05, there were receipts during the year of $4,814.25 and disbursements of $5,791.34, leaving a balance on December 31, 1969 of $6,899.96. Included in receipts is a gift of $50.00 from the Lutheran Business and Professional Women's Club, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dues assessed were $25.00 for boards, $50.00 for two-year colleges and seminaries, $100.00 for four-year colleges, and $5.00 for individuals.

Funds bequeathed by Lina R. Meyer were received in May, invested on June 1, and show interest earned of $182.85.

ENROLLMENT

Attached as Exhibit B is a partial, preliminary enrollment report as gathered by the Office of Research, Archives and Statistics, Lutheran Council in the USA. The completed report, which is to be sent participating institutions, is scheduled for release this week.

The report shows for seminaries a percent change increase of B.D./M.Div. students from last year of 6.7%; junior colleges up 1.2%; senior colleges down 1.1%; attributable to comparing the total enrollment of 36 institutions this year with 37 the previous year when Hartwick was included. Almost as many four-year colleges, however, show slight decreases in total fulltime enrollment as show comparable increases.

PRESIDENTS

New presidents serving member institutions are John H. Tietjen, Concordia Seminary, St.Louis; Thomas H. Langevin, Capital; Frank R. Barth, Gustavus Adolphus; John H. Morey, Muhlenberg; Eugene W. Weigman, Pacific Lutheran; and G. Kenneth Andeen, Wittenberg.

Presidents retiring were F. Eppling Reinartz, Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary (effective 1970); Harold L. Yochum, Capital; and Alfred O. Fuerbringer, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. Resigning to assume the presidency of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod was J. A. O. Preus, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois.

ANNUAL CONVENTION

The 55th annual convention held at the Pittsburgh Hilton, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, January 11-13, 1969 attracted 91 registrants. Its proceedings, under the theme "Whose Institutions?" were printed in quantity of 3,100 copies and distributed in similar amount.

The current annual convention has been reduced in length, from portions of three days to two one-half days, largely at the request of the Association of American Colleges, to whose annual meeting this Conference has been historically allied. The AAC requested allied groups this year not to begin their meetings prior to its opening session and to attempt to intertwine meetings with those of AAC. Because one-half the membership of this Conference does not hold membership in AAC, the Board of Directors did not move its convention from its customary pre-AAC location, but did shorten its time span.

Special guests at this year's convention are representatives from Lutheran Brotherhood, Aid Association for Lutherans, National Lutheran Campus Ministry, Wheat Ridge Foundation, and Deaconess Community of the LCA.

YEAR'S ACTIVITIES

While the constitutional function of this Conference is to provide a free forum for discussion of educational issues, there develop occasions when other services are required. This year special surveys were conducted on seminary presidential salaries, student unrest, institutional deficits and gift income. The latter survey was used by the president of the Conference to prepare a statement on the Tax Reform Act of 1969 for presentation before the Senate Committee on Finance, which was accomplished by the president and secretary-treasurer of the Conference and the vice-president of St. Olaf College.

The Board of Directors decided not to contribute funds to the support of the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, an association of Washington representatives of education associations formed to work for federal funding up to full authorization of education enactments. The decision not to contribute was made on the basis that not all member institutions had a direct stake in the outcome, and further that related institutions were approached through other education associations.

The secretary-treasurer became a member of the National Committee in Support of the Four Colleges Trust Fund, a group of eight individuals extablished to receive funds in support of the four Connecticut Catholic colleges which have been named in civil action over use of federal funds to finance construction of academic facilities. While the committee was forming in August, the secretary-treasurer consulted the officers, informed the Board prior to final arrangements, and has since informed the membership.

SECRETARY-TREASURER'S OFFICE

The Washington Office of the Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the USA, continues to maintain a special LECNA identity when opportunities present themselves, in the examples of the Emergency Committee for Full Funding, the Connecticut College case, and the Senate Committee on Finance testimony. This identity is also necessary for the many requests for information on Lutheran higher education which range from candidates for doctoral degrees to federal offices in need of special statistics or information.

It has been again this year the pleasure of the undersigned to serve you.

Howard E. Holcomb
Secretary-Treasurer

LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

TREASURER'S REPORT

DECEMBER 31, 1969

I. INCOME	1969 Budget	1969 Actual
A. Balance on Hand, January 1	$ 7,877.05	$ 7,877.05
B. Dues from Members		
1. Institutions and Boards		4,566.25
2. Individuals		208.00
	4,825.00	4,764.25
C. Gifts		50.00
TOTAL	$12,702.05	$12,691.30
II. EXPENSES		
A. Services Rendered		
1. Typing, etc.	50.00	0.00
B. General Operation		
1. Postage & Express	175.00	150.00
2. Printing	3,500.00	2,628.31
3. Stationery & Supplies	200.00	171.06
4. Telephone & Telegrams	100.00	11.20
5. Subscriptions & Dues	175.00	155.00
6. Travel for Board of Directors	1,200.00	755.99
7. Annual Meeting	1,200.00	1,804.78
8. Contingent; misc.	200.00	0.00
9. Bulk Mailing		115.00
TOTAL	$ 6,800.00	$ 5,791.34
III. Balance, December 31, 1969	$ 5,902.05	$ 6,899.96

LINA R. MEYER LECTURE FUND

I. Deposit, June 1, 1969	$5,000.00
Interest, December 31, 1969	182.85
TOTAL, December 31, 1969	$5,182.85

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS

1. Resolved, That we express our thanks to Mr. Howard E. Holcomb, Secretary-Treasurer of the Conference, for faithful and effective service.
2. Resolved, That we express our gratitude to the officers and Board of Directors of the Conference, and to those who planned and participated in the 56th Annual Convention.
3. Resolved, That we welcome the following new presidents of member institutions:
   John H. Tietjen, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
   Thomas H. Langevin, Capital University
   Frank R. Barth, Gustavus Adolphus College
   John H. Morey, Muhlenberg College
   Eugene W. Wiegman, Pacific Lutheran University
   G. Kenneth Andeen, Wittenberg University
4. Resolved, That we express our appreciation for the service to member institutions rendered by the following presidents:
   A. O. Fuerbringer, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
   Harold L. Yochum, Capital University
   Erling M. Jensen, Muhlenberg College
   Robert A. L. Mortvedt, Pacific Lutheran University
   Martin L. Cole, Texas Lutheran College
5. Resolved, That we express our congratulations and our prayers for his leadership to J. A. O. Preus, President of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, as well as our appreciation for his service to Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Illinois

Submitted by:
E. D. Farwell, Chairman
L. Dale Lund
Martin J. Neeb
January 11, 1970

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, 1970

President	Albert G. Huegli, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana
Vice-President	Sigvald D. Fauske, Waldorf College, Forest City, Iowa
Secretary-Treasurer	Howard E. Holcomb, Division of Educational Services, Lutheran Council in the USA, Washington, D.C.

Members-at-large:

Class of 1971

John W. Bachman, Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa

Arthur O. Davidson, Wagner College, Staten Island, New York

L. Dale Lund, Midland College, Fremont, Nebraska

Class of 1972

Raymond M. Bost, Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina

Raymond M. Olson, California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, California

John H. Tietjen, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri

INSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTS
LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

JOHN H. TIETJEN, *Concordia Seminary,* St. Louis, Mo.
LORMAN PETERSEN, Acting, *Concordia Theological Seminary,* Springfield, Ill.
EDWARD C. FENDT, *Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Columbus, Ohio
FREDERICK K. WENTZ, *Hamma School of Theology,* Springfield, Ohio
ALVIN N. ROGNESS, *Luther Theological Seminary,* St. Paul, Minn.
STEWART W. HERMAN, *Lutheran School of Theology,* Chicago, Ill.
DONALD R. HEIGES, *Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Gettysburg, Pa.
DONALD R. HEIGES, *Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Philadelphia, Pa.
WILLIAM E. HORDERN, *Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Saskatoon, Sask., Can.
F. EPPLING REINARTZ, *Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary,* Columbia, S.C.
CLEMENS H. ZEIDLER, *Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Minneapolis, Minn.
CHARLES M. COOPER, *Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary,* Berkeley, Calif.
KENT S. KNUTSON, *Wartburg Theological Seminary,* Dubuque, Iowa
U. S. LEUPOLD, *Waterloo Lutheran Seminary,* Waterloo, Ont., Can.

FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES

OSCAR A. ANDERSON, *Augsburg College,* Minneapolis, Minn.
CLARENCE W. SORENSEN, *Augustana College,* Rock Island, Ill.
CHARLES L. BALCER, *Augustana College,* Sioux Falls, S.D.
ARVIN W. HAHN, *Bethany College,* Lindsborg, Kan.
RAYMOND M. OLSON, *California Lutheran College,* Thousand Oaks, Calif.
THOMAS H. LANGEVIN, *Capital University,* Columbus, Ohio
HAROLD H. LENTZ, *Carthage College,* Kenosha, Wisc.
JOSEPH L. KNUTSON, *Concordia College,* Moorhead, Minn.
WILLIAM A. POEHLER, *Concordia College,* St. Paul, Minn.
MARTIN J. NEEB, *Concordia Senior College,* Ft. Wayne, Ind.
MARTIN L. KOEHNEKE, *Concordia Teachers College,* River Forest, Ill.
W. THEOPHIL JANZOW, *Concordia Teachers College,* Seward, Nebr.
C. C. MADSEN, *Dana College,* Blair, Nebr.
C. ARNOLD HANSON, *Gettysburg College,* Gettysburg, Pa.
FRANK R. BARTH, *Gustavus Adolphus College,* St. Peter, Minn.

RAYMOND M. BOST, *Lenoir Rhyne College,* Hickory, N.C.
ELWIN D. FARWELL, *Luther College,* Decorah, Iowa
JOHN F. CHOITZ, *Michigan Lutheran College,* Detroit, Mich.
L. DALE LUND, *Midland Lutheran College,* Fremont, Nebr.
JOHN H. MOREY, *Muhlenberg College,* Allentown, Pa.
A. G. D. WILES, *Newberry College,* Newberry, S.C.
EUGENE W. WIEGMAN, *Pacific Lutheran University,* Tacoma, Wash.
PERRY F. KENDIG, *Roanoke College,* Salem, Va.
SIDNEY A. RAND, *St. Olaf College,* Northfield, Minn.
GUSTAVE W. WEBER, *Susquehanna University,* Selinsgrove, Pa.
JOE K. MENN, *Texas Lutheran College,* Seguin, Texas
CHAUNCEY BLY, *Thiel College,* Greenville, Pa.
CARL G. FJELLMAN, *Upsala College,* East Orange, N.J.
ALBERT G. HUEGLI, *Valparaiso University,* Valparaiso, Ind.
ARTHUR O. DAVIDSON, *Wagner College,* Staten Island, N.Y.
JOHN W. BACHMAN, *Wartburg College,* Waverly, Iowa
FRANK C. PETERS, *Waterloo Lutheran University,* Waterloo, Ont., Can.
G. KENNETH ANDEEN, *Wittenberg University,* Springfield, Ohio

JUNIOR COLLEGES

PAUL G. ELBRECHT, *Alabama Lutheran Academy and College* Selma, Ala.
ELMER F. EGGOLD, *California Concordia College,* Oakland, Calif.
K. GLEN JOHNSON, *Camrose Lutheran College,* Camrose, Alta., Can.
ERHARDT P. WEBER, *Concordia College,* Portland, Ore.
WALTER W. STUENKEL, *Concordia College,* Milwaukee, Wisc.
ALBERT E. MEYER, *Concordia College,* Bronxville, N.Y.
PAUL A. ZIMMERMAN, *Concordia Lutheran Junior College,* Ann Arbor, Mich.
BERNT C. OPSAL, *Golden Valley Lutheran College,* Minneapolis, Minn.
ERNEST D. NIELSEN, *Grand View College,* Des Moines, Iowa
MORRIS ANDERSON, *Luther College,* Regina, Sask., Can.
J. P. WORTHINGTON, *Luther College of the Bible and Liberal Arts,* Teaneck, N.J.
REUBEN C. BEISEL, *St. John's College,* Winfield, Kan.
RALPH J. JALKANEN, *Suomi College,* Hancock, Mich.
SIGVALD D. FAUSKE, *Waldorf College,* Forest City, Iowa

BOARDS OF EDUCATION
ALC

Minneapolis, Minn.

NORMAN C. FINTEL, *Board of College Education,* Executive Director
WILLIAM LARSEN, *Board of Theological Education,* Executive Secretary

LCA

New York, N.Y.

LOUIS T. ALMÉN, *Board of College Education and Church Vocations,* Executive Secretary

E. THEODORE BACHMANN, *Board of Theological Education,* Executive Secretary

LC-MS

St. Louis, Mo.

ARTHUR A. AHLSCHWEDE, *Board for Higher Education,* Executive Secretary

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS

Convention	*Place*	*Date*	*President*	*Vice-President*	*Secretary*	*Treasurer*
1st	Harrisburg, Pa.	June, 1910	P. M. Bikle	L. H. Schuh	F. B. Sawvell	
2nd	Gettysburg, Pa.	April, 1911	J. A. Haas		F. P. Manhart	
3rd	Springfield, O.	Dec., 1912	C. G. Heckert		C. T. Benze	Prof. Martzoff
		For the years 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1917 no records are available				
4th	Maywood, Ill.	Jan., 1916	J. Henry Harms	G. A. Andreen	H. D. Hoover	Otto Mees
5th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1918	G. A. Andreen		H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
6th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1919	W. A. Granville	L. A. Vigness	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
7th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1920	L. A. Vigness	E. F. Pihlblad	H. D. Hoover	J. Stump
8th	New York City	Jan., 1921	E. E. Stauffer	H. W. Elson	H. D. Hoover	J. A. Aasgaard
9th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1922	H. D. Hoover		R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
10th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1923	Otto Mees	H. D. Hoover	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
11th	New York City	Jan., 1924	J. F. Krueger	J. A. Aasgaard	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
12th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1925	L. W. Boe	O. J. Johnson	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
13th	New York City	Jan., 1926	G. A. Andreen	C. O. Solberg	R. E. Tulloss	H. J. Arnold
14th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1927	R. E. Tulloss	E. F. Pihlblad	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
15th	Atlantic City, N.J.	Jan., 1928	E. F. Pihlblad	J. N. Brown	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
16th	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Jan., 1929	J. N. Brown	W. P. Hieronymous	H. F. Martin	H. J. Arnold
17th	Chicago, Ill.	Mar., 1930	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
18th	Indianapolis, Ind.	Jan., 1931	H. F. Martin	G. A. Andreen	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
19th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1932	O. J. Johnson	Otto Proehl	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
20th	Atlantic City, N.J.	Jan., 1933	J. C. K. Preus	Wm. Young	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
21st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1934	Wm. Young	C. Bergendoff	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
22nd	Atlanta, Ga.	Jan., 1935	Erland Nelson	J. Wargelin	Gould Wickey	H. J. Arnold
23rd	New York City	Jan., 1936	H. W. A. Hanson	Arthur Wald	J. C. K. Preus	H. J. Arnold
24th	Washington, D.C.	Jan., 1937	Conrad Bergendoff	Mary Markley	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
25th	Chicago, Ill.	Jan., 1938	Chas. J. Smith	C. M. Granskou	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
26th	Louisville, Ky.	Jan., 1939	C. M. Granskou	E. J. Braulick	H. J. Arnold	H. J. Arnold
27th	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1940	E. J. Braulick	J. C. Kinard	H. J. Arnold	
28th	Marion, Va.	June, 1941	J. C. Kinard	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	
29th	Baltimore, Md.	Jan., 1942	H. J. Arnold	V. K. Nikander	F. C. Wiegman	

RECORD OF CONVENTIONS AND OFFICERS, Continued

Convention	*Place*	*Date*	*President*	*Vice-President*	*Secretary/Treasurer*
		1943	Omitted: War-time Restrictions		
30th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1944	H. J. Arnold	J. C. Kinard	F. C. Wiegman
31st	Atlantic City, N.J.	Jan., 1945	B. M. Christensen	H. J. Arnold	F. C. Wiegman
32nd	Cleveland, O.	Jan., 1946	C. G. Shatzer	E. Lindquist	H. J. Arnold
33rd	Boston, Mass.	Jan., 1947	E. Lindquist	W. P. Hieronymous	H. J. Arnold
34th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1948	W. P. Hieronymous	T. F. Gullixon	H. J. Arnold
35th	New York City	Jan., 1949	J. N. Brown	H. L. Yochum	H. J. Arnold
36th	Cincinnati, O.	Jan., 1950	H. L. Yochum	L. M. Stavig	W. F. Zimmerman
37th	Atlantic City, N.J.	Jan., 1951	L. Tyson	E. M. Carlson	W. P. Hieronymous
38th	Washington, D.C.	Jan., 1952	E. M. Carlson	R. E. Morton	Orville Dahl
39th	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1953	R. E. Morton	C. H. Becker	Orville Dahl
40th	**Cincinnati, O.**	**Jan., 1954**	**C. H. Becker**	**V. R. Cromer**	**Orville Dahl**
41st	Washington, D.C.	Jan., 1955	V. R. Chomer	O. P. Kretzmann	Orville Dahl
42nd	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1956	O. P. Kretzmann	C. C. Stoughton	Orville Dahl
43rd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1957	C. C. Stoughton	E. B. Lawson	Orville Dahl
44th	Miami, Fla.	Jan., 1958	E. B. Lawson	J. W. Ylvisaker	Gould Wickey
45th	Kansas City, Mo.	Jan., 1959	J. W. Ylvisaker	M. Neeb	Gould Wickey

					Treasurer	*Secretary and Executive Director*
46th	Boston, Mass.	Jan., 1960	M. J. Neeb	L. M. Stavig	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
47th	Denver, Colo.	Jan., 1961	L. M. Stavig	H. S. Oberly	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
48th	Cleveland, O.	Jan., 1962	H. S. Oberly	K. E. Mattson	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
49th	Atlantic City, N.J.	Jan., 1963	K. E. Mattson	A. O. Fuerbringer	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
50th	Washington, D.C.	Jan., 1964	A. O. Fuerbringer	P. W. Dieckman	A. Barbara Wiegand	Gould Wickey
51st	St. Louis, Mo.	Jan., 1965	P. W. Dieckman	R. L. Mortvedt	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
52nd	Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan., 1966	R. L. Mortvedt	A. N. Rogness	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
53rd	Los Angeles, Cal.	Jan., 1967	A. N. Rogness	E. N. Jensen	Chas. H. Solem	Gould Wickey
54th	Minneapolis, Minn.	Jan., 1968	E. Jensen	S. A. Rand	Howard Holcomb	Gould Wickey
					Secretary-Treasurer	
55th	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Jan., 1969	Sidney A. Rand	J. A. O. Preus	Howard Holcomb	
56th	Houston, Tex.	Jan., 1970	Albert G. Huegli	Sigvald Fauske	Howard Holcomb	